Today's Topics:
                              A new ham
                    Callsign database, Macmorse.
                    Costas Loop in Digital Form
                  Curtis Braun...radios on aircraft
                          doppler vs. superDF
                  Emergency Service (was FCC letter)
                          Help...Please!
                          Omni-D advice ?
                  Product Review: HMC-2 VOX HEADSET
                              Tubes

Date: 15 Nov 89 15:18:40 GMT
From: gem.mps.ohio-state.edu!samsung!cs.utexas.edu!uwm.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!tank!
toto@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu (Sandra Jessica Smyth)
Subject: A new ham

In article <322@indep1.UUCP> pete@indep1.UUCP (Peter Franks) writes:
:In article <28686@genrad.UUCP> dls@genrad.com (Diana L. Syriac) writes:
:>I was quite touched to receive the following email from a new ham, and
:>thought it was worth sharing with the rest of the world. (I have deleted
:>the name, since I didn't get his permission to print this letter):
:>
:> [letter followed]
:>Sincerely,
:>   <name deleted>,   N6WUR (Technician)
:
:Diana,
:
:Have you ever heard of a CALLBOOK? If not (and it's obvious you
:haven't), let me tell you about it. By looking in the U.S. Callbook,
:ANYONE having a U.S. amateur's call letters (assuming they are valid and
:not too new), can find out the name and address that are listed on that
:license.
:
:What that means is that, by providing call letters, you HAVE
:provided his name -- maybe not right now, but definitely when the Callbook
:or Supplement containing it comes out.
:
:Maybe you should get his permission.
:
:--

```
:+-----------------------------------------------------------------------+
:|  Peter Franks  |            pete@indep1.mcs.com  OR  pete@indep1.uucp  |
:|     NI9D       |                Use whichever one works for you        |
:+-----------------------------------------------------------------------+
```

This, humble readers, is an example of a communication that should
have been email rather than a posting to Usenet.

Of course, perhaps it is also an example of the bad manners reportedly
used by some big ticket holders on the air.
--
Sandra Jessica Smyth   Believer in lost causes
toto@tank.uchicago.edu

Date: 15 Nov 89 20:05:39 GMT
From: swrinde!gem.mps.ohio-state.edu!sunybcs!bowen@ucsd.edu   (Devon Bowen)
Subject: Callsign database, Macmorse.

In article <8911150803.AA02729@ucbvax.Berkeley.EDU>,
JORDAN@LL.LL.MIT.EDU ("Mike Jordan G4ASQ") writes:
> I have had no luck with the callsign server on marvin.cs - I can Telnet
> to the default port & get the login prompt, but when I ask for port 2000
> all I get is silence...

I have heard this from a number of people. It's most likely a problem with
your software not answering my telnet option requests. It can probably be
fixed, but I need to watch the software as someone with this problem tries
to connect. And when I tell these people that, I never hear from them again.
I'm willing to put my time into making it work, but I have to have help from
the other end.

Sorry, you just hit one of my pet peeves...

Devon

Date: 15 Nov 89 17:28:45 GMT
From: cs.utexas.edu!oakhill!charlie@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu   (Charlie Thompson)
Subject: Costas Loop in Digital Form

I am looking for software implementations of a Costas Loop. I
have the original old paper written by the man himself but I
was looking for someone who might have done this in software
such as DSP code for one of the DSP's or even C for that matter.

Any leads would be appreciated.

-Charlie Thompson

Date: Wed, 15 Nov 89 11:33:50 CST
From: dube@cpdvax.csc.ti.com (DUBE TODD)
Subject: Curtis Braun...radios on aircraft

The airplane radios use external antennae. Rf radiated within the system
ground can't go anywhere but into the wiring so that the entire airplane becomes
the receiving antenna.
   "Rights without responsibilities is like a bull in a china shop"
-73, Dube Todd, N5PDK

Date: 15 Nov 89 16:29:14 GMT
From: agate!shelby!neon!kaufman@ucbvax.Berkeley.EDU   (Marc T. Kaufman)
Subject: doppler vs. superDF

In article <901@anasaz.UUCP> john@anasaz.UUCP (John Moore) writes:

>The doppler has the following advantages:
> (1) it has no moving parts. This means that one person can drive
>   a vehicle and read the doppler at the same time...

Don't do it! I can't tell you all the "almost" accidents I had trying to
drive and read a doppler display simultaneously. It is REALLY distracting!
I always take along a copilot, and HE watches the doppler. Besides, you have
to give it somewhat undivided attention to average out the multipath when you
are moving. NOT a good thing to do in traffic.

Marc Kaufman (kaufman@Neon.stanford.edu)

Date: 15 Nov 89 18:22:44 GMT
From: mips!wyse!stevew@apple.com   (Steve Wilson xttemp dept303)
Subject: Emergency Service (was FCC letter)

In article <583@rsiatl.UUCP> jgd@rsiatl.UUCP (John G. De Armond) writes:
>In article <2519@wyse.wyse.com> stevew@wyse.UUCP (Steve Wilson xttemp dept303)
writes:
>RACES is nonexistent here as far as I can tell. (Thank heavens!)
>Yet another difference. I suppose we could save a lot of bandwidth by

>acknowledging that there are major differences between hams here and
>there.
OK.

>>This is where I'm going to ask you if you've ever heard of the Incident
>>Command System. It is a management system that we use in California
>>to deal with multi-jurisdictional situations like wild-land fires.
>
>No. Not in use with any agency I've ever worked with. May be in use
>here in Georgia but I doubt it. All the Public Service frequencies
>I listen to on the scanner save one still use the good 'ole 10 codes.
>
>>The system presents a management structure to run large events under
>>and supports a common language to be used by the particpants(no more
>>10's code Thank GOD). Within this stucture there is a definition of
>>each major function that is needed in a large event such as "Incident
>>Commander, Public Information Officer, Tactical," etc.
>
>I just can't resist. Our lack of this bureaucracy may be one of the
>reasons a person can live here comfortably on less than a 6 digit salary
>:-) :-) :-)

Could be, seriously, this system is worth talking about in it's own
right. It evolved from the yearly wild-land fires that we experience
in California. I believe it was developed by the California Dept of
Forestry (CDF) on a grant from the US Forest Service. (CDF had lots
of help from local fire depts on this, I don't want to get anyone
mad ;-) Anywho, the system deals with the reality that multiple
jurisdictions get involved as a fire moves from a municipalities
jurisdiction on to US forest service property, then over to CDF
property, etc. Its a management system that scales from single
engine events to 5000 person crews working against 100,000 acre
fires. It provides a command structure, financial accounting system,
a common language definition(REAL important), and a set of management
principals. When you look at an ICS management structure it looks
alot like a medium size company org chart. It is in use throughout
California, and I believe that the US Forest Service employs the
system as well. The other point is that ICS is usable for more than
just large fires. Management of major disasters(such as earthquakes)
where large areas are effected fall into its capabilities.

>Seriously, that kind of organization would be considered utopia here.
>It was a major accomplishment when the state of Tennessee got a statewide
>ringdown line between all agencies. Lest I leave the wrong impression,
>I believe that in the case of Tennessee, for which I'm most familiar,
>they are doing all that's necessary and in fact are doing all that is
>appropriate.

The thing about ICS is that its just a way of doing things. It requires
training of all of the participants certainly, but it allows everyone
to communicate. Ever run into the problem of two different services
(and their respective 10's codes ;-) trying to talk to each other?
Something gets lost in the translation. Anyway, enough about ICS.

>>True enough. Within my city ARES group the majority hold BS degress in either
>I would not hold that against 'em. They may be OK anyway :-) ^^^^^^^
At least I spelled "degrees" right!

>>>Quite frankly, yes. Anyone who is handy with tools can take an antenna
>>>out of a package, hook cable up to it, and plug the transceiver in.
>>>That is the extent of many ham's technical knowledge these days.
>>
>>I just can't except this. You forgot a couple of small details like
>   ^^^ accept? That BS degree at work again :-) :-) :-) :-)
Look, I'm an engineer! The fact that I can write at all should be considered
in my favor! :-) Gee, this could start a whole new battle on the net
if we don't watch it. ;-)

>>making the darn thing be more than just a dead short to the radio.
>>Few are the antennas that I've seen that have an acceptable match the first
>>time you put them up.
>
>Finding a short in a transmission line WOULD challenge a significant
>number of hams. I'd guestimate that the level of technical ability
>is roughly parallel between the typical ham and the typical hard-core
>CBer.

I won't defame the CBer's, or try and estimate their general skill
level. However, I'd guess that you'll find a skill level in hams
roughly proportional to the number of years they've been licensed.
Makes sense when you look at it from that angle. I'd guess I've put
more antennas up, built/designed more projects, etc. than the guy
who has been licensed half as long.

>>Again this is one area that we are going to continue to disagree.
>>Why is the DOD sueing the FCC? ;-)
>
>Without trying to sound rhetorical, just who do you think will win in
>the long run in this suit. Even if the DOD, and by implication, ham radio
>wins, who do you think would be most vunerable to future actions by the
>Commission?   The DOD does not really have anything to loose or to worry
>about. We do.

Well, I'd disagree in that the National Communications System has us
integrated into their world war III plans. They'd have to rewrite them ;-)

>I had to make a decision when I moved to Georgia. I have limited
>time for ham radio, trying to run a company and all. My interest
>is much more toward packet at the moment. I have to limit my
>emergency activity to responding to actual events. I simply don't have
>time to become a manager again. And I really don't want to tackle
>GEMA which is in much poorer shape than TEMA was. It pains me to
>have to take that position but I simply have to.
>
>I am heartened to see the local emergency groups getting more in tune
>with the needs. Things are looking up.
>
Isn't it a bitch that you can't make a living as a ham! ;-)

I want to respond to something (KA9Q)Phil said in a recent posting
about tactial traffic handling. This is in direct relation to
my experience with the earthquake. During our critiques several
of the packeteers asked why we hadn't used packet more extensively.
(This comment applies STRICTLY to the Santa Clara Valley operations since
thats where I was) The first problem is strictly a matter of availablity.
It is essentially impossible to ask someone to respond to the middle of
the woods where some of our shelter operations got set up and ask that
person to leave their $1000 portable packet setup for the next shift.
If you respond by saying that we could have recruited different packet
ops for each location with their own equipment you'll find that there
isn't THAT much portable hardware available. Another point is that
the volume of traffic out of a given location just wasn't that high.
Packet seems to become appropriate in situations where there is a
high volume of traffic between two or more points. This operation
had several traffic sources with each location generating a few
pieces an hour thus causing a fairly constant voice net operation.
In summary, for the tactical operations requirements that we encountered
packet wasn't the right solution to the problem.

Note that the packet BBS system played a huge role in the movement
of H&W traffic. I've heard numbers like 7000-10000 messages being
moved during a one week period. This is where the technology really
proved itself!

73's de Steve KA6S

Date: 15 Nov 89 21:20:20 GMT
From: gem.mps.ohio-state.edu!usc!merlin.usc.edu!aludra.usc.edu!skoh@tut.cis.ohio-
state.edu (S. Koh)
Subject: Help...Please!

Hello,

A good friend of mine just received (as a gift) a HeathKit HWS-24HT
(this is a 5W dual band portable that receives 130-170 and 418-470Mhz
and transmits 2m and 70cm).

Since he does not have access to the net, I promised that I would post
a message asking for any modifications, comments, suggestions, etc.,
regarding the unit.

The HeathKit would not have been his first choice, but as he puts it,
"it works great for free!". I have clocked the radio both in 2m and
70cm ranges with my counter and it seems to be extremely precise!

Also, he has been told that the radio is MARS/CAP modifiable, but is
not sure that is true.

Thanks everyone for the help!!

Please send responses to me here at USC the account, (as listed above)
is: skoh@aludra.usc.edu and I will pass them along.

Date: Wed, 15 Nov 89 13:12:02 EST
From: Michael_Edelman%Wayne-MTS@um.cc.umich.edu
Subject: Omni-D advice ?

Now that my Omni is on its way to me and I will once again be joining
the sacred ranks of Ten Tec afficienados, I'd like to hear with those
out there with advice to share. To wit: Experiences, good, bad and
indifferent with the company and the equipment; mods; service notes;
filter choices; and anything else that crosses your mind. If there is enough
interest I will summerize to the net.
        x049;
        ke8yy
 Mike Edelman
 Wayne State University / 5925 Woodward / Detroit, MI 48202
 Michael_Edelman@um.cc.umich.edu (reliable)
 Michael_Edelman%Wayne-Mts@um.cc.umich.edu (direct)
 MEDELMAN@WAYNEST1 / 1-313-577-0742 / fax: 1-313-577-5500

Date: 15 Nov 89 19:14:04 GMT
From: rochester!rit!ultb!cep4478@cu-arpa.cs.cornell.edu (C.E. Piggott)
Subject: Product Review: HMC-2 VOX HEADSET

In article <1022@unsvax.NEVADA.EDU> storkus@arrakis.nevada.edu (Mike Storke)
writes:
> I was wondering how much it cost you and if it would work with my radio.

Hi Mike + Net ...

    The headset lists for around $57.00 from Kenwood. Unfortunately,
it looks like EVERYBODY sells such accessories at list price, with no
discounts to be find - when it comes to hand/speaker mics, headsets, PL
boards, etc. it is REALLY worth waiting for your next hamfest.

    As far as what radio it will work on ... this is an interesting
question, that I've fought with several times hooking packet TNC's up
to various handhelds. For the kenwood 215 and 25 series HT's, there
is a separate PTT line. It is from this line that the vox unit in
the HMC-2 is powered. It is probably not worth modifying and building
connectors for this headset to work on your radio ... you would be better
off with one that uses the same PTT scheme (of the radio sensing the
presence or lack of the microphone element itself upon PTT) as yours
does. I think that the IC-2AT's use that scheme, and the older Yaesu's,
don't they?

    Furthermore, if you were to buy an ICOM model instead of the
Kenwood, you would get the "traditional" earphone style, rather than
the separate ear plug arrangement that is attatched to the HMC-2.

    I am curious ... does anybody know why manufacturers would go
to the trouble to have the microphone-in-line PTT system, instead of just
a wire that goes to the switch and gets grounded when you push it? It
sure seems like a lot more work to build the radio that way. I'm glad
most of them don't do that any more.

                          73, Chris N2JGW
cep4478@ultb.isc.rit.edu
n2jgw@wb2wxq

Date: Wed, 15 Nov 89 10:02:39 EST
From: Robert Carpenter <rc@cmr.ncsl.nist.gov>
Subject: Tubes

Somebody recently asked about sources for tubes for their Motorola rig.
One type mentioned was the 6907. That is a type made by Amperex, a
Philips company. I think a 6252 would be essentially identical. They
are "much better" versions of the old 832.

Bob, W3OTC

End of INFO-HAMS Digest V89 Issue #886
****